

REMARKS

Amendments to the specification have been made to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors.

Claims 15, 17, 18, and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 15 and 36 have been amended to recite the elements of their parent claims and are now independent. Claim 17 as original written is in independent form. Claim 18 depends on claim 17. Therefore claims 17 and 18 do not need to be rewritten. Claims 15, 17, 18, and 36 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-14, 16, 19-35, and 37-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claims 24-25, 37-38, and 45-46 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 8, 12, 14, 15, 19, 28, 34, 36, 40-44, and 47-50 have been amended.

Claims 1-23, 26-36, 39-44, and 47-50 remain in this application.

Examiner Interview

An Examiner Interview took place by telephone with Examiner Thomas Ho and Emmanuel Rivera on April 8, 2004.

It was pointed out that claim 17 as originally written is in independent form, and that claim 18 depends from claim 17. Claims 15 and 36 will be amended as independent claims to include the limitations of the rejected claims. Amended claims 15 and 36 are presented in the listing of claims section of this response.

The Office has rejected claims 1-14, 16, 19-35, and 37-50 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated based on U.S. Patent 5,907,621 to Bachman et al (Bachman).

1 Mr. Rivera pointed out that independent claims 1, 8, 42, 43, 49, and 50
2 recite a "token using one-way encryption". One-way encryption particularly
3 provides for an encryption scheme that encrypts an object (e.g., token) such that it
4 cannot be decrypted, either by the receiver, sender, or any other party.

5 It was presented that the specification describes a distinction between one-
6 way encryption schemes and typical two-way encryption schemes which allow
7 decryption of the object (e.g., token). One-way encryption is used to deter
8 malevolent parties (including the receiver) from the ability of decrypting the token
9 and modifying the token.

10 Furthermore, it was discussed that it is well known in the art that there is a
11 distinction and difference between one-way and two-way encryption. Specific
12 reference was made to "Applied Cryptography" by Bruce Schneier. Examiner Ho
13 was referred to page 29 of Schneier that describes one-way encryption or one-way
14 functions.

15 It was further presented that Bachman specifically describes that the token
16 be allowed to be decrypted. Examiner Ho was referred to col. 6, lines 22 to 26 of
17 Bachman which states "[A]t the server, the server program passes the submission
18 through to the session object where *the token is decrypted* at block 423 to expose a
19 multi-byte field of token information including an index". Bachman not only
20 describes that the token is decrypted, but relies that the token be decrypted in order
21 for the server to expose the token information. Therefore, a token that cannot be
22 decrypted is of no use and counterintuitive to what is disclosed or suggested in
23 Bachman.

24 It was agreed by Examiner Ho that Bachman did show decryption of the
25 token which is provided in two-way encryption schemes. Bachman does not show

1 one-way encryption which prevents the decryption of the token. It was agreed that
2 the language "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted" is not disclose or
3 suggested by Bachman.

4 Therefore to distinguish the claims from Bachman, the independent claims
5 are amended to recite "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted" as suggested
6 by Examiner Ho. Examiner Ho agreed that this language overcomes the Bachman
7 reference; however, Examiner Ho required additional searching to determine if the
8 claims as presented are allowable.

9
10 **35 U.S.C. §102**

11 **Claims 1-14, 16, 19-35, and 37-50**

12 Claims 1-14, 16, 19-35, and 37-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as
13 being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,907,621 to Bachman et al (Bachman).
14 Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

15 **Amended independent claim 1, for example, recites**

16 A session-state management method comprising:

17 generating an encoded session-state token, wherein the token
18 incorporates a representation of session state of a client;

19 encrypting the encoded token to produce an encrypted token that
20 cannot be decrypted; and

21 sending the encrypted token to the client.

22 As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman
23 does not disclose or suggest "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted."
24 Therefore amended claim 1 is allowable over Bachman.
25

1 Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be
2 withdrawn.

3 Dependent claims 2-7 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base
4 claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 2-7 be
5 withdrawn.

6 Amended independent claim 8 recites in part "token that cannot be
7 decrypted".

8 As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman
9 does not disclose or suggest a "token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore
10 amended claim 8 is allowable over Bachman.

11 Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 8 be
12 withdrawn.

13 Dependent claims 9-15, and 16 are allowable by virtue of their
14 dependency on base claim 8. Applicants respectfully request that the §102
15 rejection of claims 9-15, and 16 be withdrawn.

16 Amended independent claim 19 recites in part "an encrypted token that
17 cannot be decrypted".

18 As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman
19 does not disclose or suggest "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted".
20 Therefore amended claim 19 is allowable over Bachman.

21 Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 19 be
22 withdrawn.

23 Dependent claims 20-27 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on
24 base claim 19. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims
25 20-27 be withdrawn.

1 **Amended independent claim 28** recites in part "an encrypted token that
2 cannot be decrypted".

3 As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman
4 does not disclose or suggest "an encrypted token that cannot be decrypted".
5 Therefore amended claim 28 is allowable over Bachman.

6 **Dependent claims 29-33** are allowable by virtue of their dependency on
7 base claim 28. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims
8 29-33 be withdrawn.

9 **Amended independent claim 34** recites in part "an encoded session-sate
10 token that cannot be decrypted".

11 As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman
12 does not disclose or suggest "an encoded session-sate token that cannot be
13 decrypted". Therefore amended claim 34 is allowable over Bachman.

14 Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 34 be
15 withdrawn.

16 **Dependent claims 35-39** are allowable by virtue of their dependency on
17 base claim 34. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims
18 35-39 be withdrawn.

19 **Amended independent claim 40** recites in part "an encoded token that
20 cannot be decrypted".

21 As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman
22 does not disclose or suggest "an encoded token that cannot be decrypted".
23 Therefore amended claim 40 is allowable over Bachman.

24 Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 40 be
25 withdrawn.

1 **Dependent claim 41** is allowable by virtue of its dependency on base claim
2 40. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 41 be
3 withdrawn.

4 **Amended independent claims 42 and 43** recite in part "token that cannot
5 be decrypted".

6 As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman
7 does not disclose or suggest "token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore amended
8 claims 42 and 43 are allowable over Bachman.

9 Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 42 and 43
10 be withdrawn.

11 **Amended independent claim 44** recites in part "a token that cannot be
12 decrypted".

13 As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman
14 does not disclose or suggest "a token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore
15 amended claim 44 is allowable over Bachman.

16 Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 44 be
17 withdrawn.

18 **Dependent claims 45-46** are allowable by virtue of their dependency on
19 base claim 44. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims
20 45-46 be withdrawn.

21 **Amended independent claims 47-50** recite in part "token that cannot be
22 decrypted".

23 As discussed in the Examiner Interview and agreed by the Office, Bachman
24 does not disclose or suggest "token that cannot be decrypted". Therefore amended
25 claims 47-50 are allowable over Bachman.

1 Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 47-50 be
2 withdrawn.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-23, 26-36, 39-44, and 47-50 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 5/5/04By: 

Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256 ext. 245